



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fwd

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,049	09/15/2003	Michael Steven Pickard	8285-633	2583
7590	02/24/2006		EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			DEANE JR, WILLIAM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2642	

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/664,049	PICKARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J. Deane	2642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 2, 4, 6 – 9, 11,13 – 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,420 (Koponen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,373 (Lee et al.).

With respect to claims 1 – 2, 4, 6 – 9, 11,13 – 14, 16 and 18 note that Koponen teaches detecting that a telephone set has been connected to a telephone line, identifying the line, retrieving call features from a database associated with the telephone line and communicating the call features to the telephone set (Col. 1, lines 44 – 54, Col. 2, lines 12 – 17 and Figs 1a and 1b).

What Koponen does not explicitly teach the calling feature of speed dialing however; speed dialing is an old call feature as taught by Lee et al. in Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to have incorporated such a calling feature like speed dialing as by Lee et al. into the Koponen system as such would only entail the adding of a well-known calling feature to a device that was designed to use calling features.

Claims 3, 5,10, 12 and 15 and 17 - 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koponen in view of Lee et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,206,899 (Gupta et al.)

With respect to claims 3, 10 and 15, Koponen and Lee et al. teach the claimed limitations except for the use of ANI to identify a line. Such is notoriously old in the art as shown by Gupta et al. (note Abstract of Gupta et al.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated ANI for line identification as taught by Gupta et al. into the Koponen/Lee et al. system (if not already inherent) as such would only entail substituting one line identification means for another.

With respect to claims 5, 12 and 17, note menus in Figs. 1a and 1b of Koponen or Fig. 2 and memory 111 Lee et al. and menu options (Fig. 5) in Gupta et al.

With respect to claims 6, 11 and 18, these claims are further rejected in view of Fig. 2 and memory 111 Lee et al.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Note the references on the accompanying 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bill Deane whose telephone number is (571) 272-7484. In addition, facsimile transmissions should be directed to Bill Deane at facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

11Feb2006


WILLIAM J. DEANE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER